

To: Lensink, Andy[Lensink.Andy@epa.gov]
From: Duffy, William
Sent: Sat 7/16/2016 4:29:51 PM
Subject: RE: Smelter Hill Uplands RDU 3 NOIC letter
Smelter Hill UAO - AR NOIC 2016.07.17.pdf

Andy – a week back from vacation and wishing I had stayed on the east coast. Jean elected to submit the letter before I returned because of the text in the UAO that described a different date for submittal of comments from the deadline for the letter confirming intent to comply. In any event, the final letter follows the same structure that we discussed.

Thanks for providing EPA's confirmation that the real property notice (para. 52) may be deferred and that EPA will defer its response to the three NOIC letters that have been submitted.

Bill

From: Lensink, Andy [mailto:Lensink.Andy@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 05, 2016 10:43 AM
To: Duffy, William
Subject: RE: Smelter Hill Uplands RDU 3 NOIC letter

Bill:

You're welcome.

I know you'll read this when you get back, so here's hoping you had a good, relaxing vacation.

Andy

From: Duffy, William [mailto:William.Duffy@dgslaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:13 PM

To: Lensink, Andy <Lensink.Andy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Smelter Hill Uplands RDU 3 NOIC letter

Thanks for the quick review.

Bill

From: Lensink, Andy [<mailto:Lensink.Andy@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Duffy, William
Subject: RE: Smelter Hill Uplands RDU 3 NOIC letter

Bill:

Actually, I was able to look this over this over.

I think it's fine and will have no problem responding and agreeing.

Andy

From: Duffy, William [<mailto:William.Duffy@dgsllaw.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Lensink, Andy <Lensink.Andy@epa.gov>
Subject: Smelter Hill Uplands RDU 3 NOIC letter

Andy – I am sharing the opening paragraphs of what will be completed as Atlantic Richfield's NOIC letter for the Smelter Hill Uplands UAO. Please take a look at the text which proposes two things: (a) defer AR's submittal of a Para. 52 notice for recording that describes Affected

Property to no later than September 30th, and (b) defer EPA's response to the three NOIC letters (CSOU, WSC and Smelter Hill) to January 2017, with the possibility of deferring further so long as we are making progress on the Site-wide issues.

Please let me know if my wording is acceptable, and offer suggestions if you have any that would allow EPA to concur on deferral. The rest of the letter will look a lot like the WSC NOIC letter. Thanks.

Bill

William Duffy Partner

P: 303.892.7372 ▪ F: 303.893.1379 ▪ M: 720.234.5971 ▪ [vcard](#)

Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP

1550 17th Street, Suite 500 ▪ Denver, CO 80202

This email message, and its attachment(s), is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

A LexMundi Member